



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

June, 1895), signed by Karl Lentzner, now of Oxford, England. They also owe thanks to several of their readers who have kindly made them aware of the editorial oversight to which the appearance of Lentzner's article in these columns is due. The article in question is a translation of Holthausen's sanctioned translation of an article by Ludwig Wimmer. Holthausen's translation appeared in *Germania* xxxi (N. R. xix), pp. 357 f., and is dated Dec. 30, 1895. These are the facts. The only comment I deem necessary is to beg Lentzner to read and heed what I have said of him in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. ix, 502, and vol. xi, 512. Lentzner has now sinned most flagrantly in three instances which have been somewhat promptly discovered. If he has the temerity to continue in this way, editors will have to rely upon their own sagacity to keep them from being led into such humiliating apologies as that which I now make on behalf of the editors of this Journal.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PHILOLOGICAL CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Mr. Greene writing in your February issue of the Philological Congress at Philadelphia, makes the following statement:

"This is the first occasion on which the Modern Language Association has become a fraction of a larger philological unit; for the simultaneous meetings of various societies held at Chicago in 1893 were an aggregate of integers. The program of the meetings at Philadelphia included both joint and simultaneous sessions."

I beg to say that the latter statement applies equally to the Chicago Congress, and that consequently the former statement is inaccurate. There were general sessions of the Chicago Congress on the twelfth and fourteenth of July, partly to bring the various bodies together, partly to do honor to our distinguished European guests. A reference to the programme (which I enclose) will substantiate this statement.

WILLIAM MORTON PAYNE,

Chairman Committee of Arrangements.

Chicago.

PHILOLOGICAL CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I thank you for calling my attention to Mr. Payne's letter, and for giving me an opportunity to correct my statement, which, it appears, was not sufficiently guarded.

On referring to the programs of the general sessions, indicated by Mr. Payne, I find, however, that every paper presented was by a worker in ancient languages,—Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Assyriology, Comparative Philology; also that the presiding officers (in both cases admirably chosen) were classical scholars. In the sense that no other meetings were appointed for the same hour, these meetings might be regarded as general sessions, as they were set down on the program: practically, however, they were meetings of the American Philological Association, which all were invited to attend. I attended the very interesting session of July 12th; but I felt that I was present as a member of the American Philological Association, not of the Modern Language Association. The Secretary of the Modern Language Association informs me that he was never consulted with regard to the general sessions.

The program of the joint session at Philadelphia, at which papers were read, was prepared by joint action of the secretaries of the various associations, which were represented in the program as follows:—the American Philological Association was represented by two papers; the American Oriental Society, by two papers; the Modern Language Association of America, by two papers; the Archæological Institute of America, by one paper; the American Dialect Society, by one paper. This was, indeed, a joint program of a joint session: perhaps the terms "general session" and "joint session" will serve to indicate the difference in character between the meetings at Chicago and those at Philadelphia.

At the three joint sessions held at Philadelphia the presiding officers were the presidents, respectively, of the Modern Language Association of America, the American Philological Association, and the American Oriental Society.

HERBERT EVELETH GREENE.

Johns Hopkins University.